

Global Convergence of Continual Learning on Non-IID Data

Fei Zhu*

ZHFEI2018@GMAIL.COM

Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, Hong Kong Institute of Science & Innovation, CAS

Yujing Liu*

YUJING@AMSS.AC.CN

Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS

Wenzhuo Liu

LIUWENZHUO2020@IA.AC.CN

State Key Laboratory of Multimodal Artificial Intelligence Systems, Institute of Automation, CAS

School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

Zhaoxiang Zhang[†]

ZHAOXIANG.ZHANG@IA.AC.CN

State Key Laboratory of Multimodal Artificial Intelligence Systems, Institute of Automation, CAS

School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

* *These authors contributed equally to this work*

[†] *Corresponding author: zhaoxiang.zhang@ia.ac.cn*

Abstract

Continual learning, which aims to learn multiple tasks sequentially, has gained extensive attention. However, most existing work focuses on empirical studies, and the theoretical aspect remains under-explored. Recently, a few investigations have considered the theory of continual learning only for linear regressions, establishes the results based on the strict independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) assumption and the persistent excitation on the feature data that may be difficult to verify or guarantee in practice. To overcome this fundamental limitation, in this paper, we provide a general and comprehensive theoretical analysis for continual learning of regression models. By utilizing the stochastic Lyapunov function and martingale estimation techniques, we establish the almost sure convergence results of continual learning under a general data condition for the first time. Additionally, without any excitation condition imposed on the data, the convergence rates for the forgetting and regret metrics are provided.

Keywords: Continual learning, incremental learning, catastrophic forgetting, non-i.i.d. data

1. Introduction

Continual learning (CL) (Thrun and Mitchell, 1995), also known as incremental learning or lifelong learning, is an essential machine learning paradigm that enables the model to adapt and learn from a continuous stream of tasks over time (Van de Ven et al., 2022; Dohare et al., 2024). Unlike traditional single-task learning, where a model is trained on a fixed dataset, CL emphasizes the sequential acquisition of knowledge across multiple tasks, requiring the model to retain and leverage previously learned information when learning the new task. For example, an autonomous car that is trained in a city would encounter other environments (e.g., forest, desert, countryside) with different data distributions (Verwimp et al., 2023), and the car is supposed to adapt to those new environments while maintaining the ability in past environments. Besides, CL is also essential for many other applications such as foundational models (Yang et al., 2024; Bommasani et al., 2021), embodied robot (Lesort et al., 2020), medical diagnosis (Lee and Lee, 2020; Perkonigg et al., 2021) and personalized recommendations (Xie et al., 2020; Mi et al., 2020), in which the model must adapt

to evolving data distributions over time without forgetting previous knowledge. However, without storing old data, the model would lose previous knowledge when adapting to new data, which is known as catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; Goodfellow et al., 2013). As a result, CL becomes fundamentally more complex than single-task learning, requiring sophisticated mechanisms to balance the retention of older knowledge with the assimilation of new information.

Related Works. In the past years, continual learning has received much attention in machine learning community, and a variety of empirical methods have been proposed (De Lange et al., 2021; Van de Ven et al., 2022). In general, they can be divided into three main families. Regularization-based methods (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Zenke et al., 2017; Aljundi et al., 2018; Li and Hoiem, 2017) identify and penalize the changes of important parameters of the original network when learning new tasks. Replay-based methods alleviate catastrophic forgetting by storing and replaying some raw data (Rebuffi et al., 2017; Chaudhry et al., 2018; Riemer et al., 2019; Jin et al., 2021) or prototypes (Zhu et al., 2021) of old tasks. Parameter-isolation methods (Rusu et al., 2016; Schwarz et al., 2018; Serra et al., 2018; Cortes et al., 2017; Xu and Zhu, 2018) freeze the old network and dynamically extend it during the course of CL. More recent works build on pre-trained vision-language models (Wang et al., 2022), large language models (Ke et al., 2023), or large multimodal models (Zeng et al., 2024) and train small learnable parameters, e.g., prompt or LoRA (Hu et al., 2021), to dynamically instruct models in tackling tasks sequentially. Besides, some studies focus on more sophisticated CL settings such as long-tailed (Liu et al., 2022), few-shot (Mazumder et al., 2021; Tian et al., 2024) and federated (Yoon et al., 2021; Guo et al., 2024) continual learning.

Although significant progress has been made in the empirical aspect, theoretical studies of continual learning are still largely unexplored. In this context, the generalization error and forgetting for orthogonal gradient descent method (Zeng et al., 2019; Farajtabar et al., 2020) has been studied within the neural tangent kernel framework (Bennani and Sugiyama, 2020; Doan et al., 2021). The impact of task similarity on forgetting has been investigated in teacher-student setup (Lee et al., 2021; Asanuma et al., 2021) and overparameterized regimes (Lin et al., 2023; Evron et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2024; Goldfarb et al., 2024). Besides, Kim et al. (2022) demonstrated the connection between task and class continual learning, and further proved that class continual learning is learnable (Kim et al., 2023). Peng et al. (2023) proposed an ideal continual learner and connected it with existing methods. Evron et al. (2023) studied CL on a sequence of separable linear classification tasks with binary labels, and developed upper bounds on the forgetting. Due to the clear formulation and advantages in real-world applications (i.e. without storing old data or expanding the model), regularization-based continual learning has become a focus of recent theoretical studies (Li et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024).

Limitations of Existing Work. Despite these advancements, existing theoretical investigations on the continual learning problem suffers from some fundamental limitations.

Firstly, all prior theoretical works adopt a naive locally-iid assumption, where the input data in each task is required to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) to reduce the difficulty of theoretical analysis. For example, Lee et al. (2021), Asanuma et al. (2021), Swartworth et al. (2023), Lin et al. (2023) and Banayeeanzade et al. (2024) assumed all data are sampled from a standard Gaussian distribution. Ding et al. (2024) attempted to relax the standard Gaussian data assumption to the condition that population data covariance matrix satisfies the general fourth moment. However, the i.i.d. data assumption is still required in (Ding et al., 2024) others studies (Li et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2023). Nevertheless, the i.i.d. data assumption often fails to align with

real-world applications exhibiting more dynamic and complex distributions (Kejriwal et al., 2024). Recently, a few empirical studies call for establishing CL benchmarks in which distribution shifts arise gradually from the passage of time (Lin et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2022). Theoretically, it still remains an open question whether the i.i.d data assumption can be essentially removed for the parameter estimation of continual learning systems where data from multiple sources or environments emerge sequentially.

Secondly, previous theoretical studies require other relatively stringent assumptions that may not be applicable in practice. For example, Zhao et al. (2024) assumed that the accumulated covariance matrix is full-rank in the process of continual learning, which is known as the persistent excitation (Narendra and Annaswamy, 1987) that ensures the features are sufficiently diverse. Regarding to system noise, Evron et al. (2022, 2023) and Peng et al. (2023) assumed the model is noiseless and others (Lin et al., 2023; Evron et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024; Banayeeanzade et al., 2024) assumed the noise to be well-specific with a standard Gaussian distribution. However, real-world data often suffers from heavy-tailed or skewed noise due to certain physical processes or sensor errors. Therefore, the persistent excitation and noise conditions are difficult to be satisfied or verified in many scenarios, especially in stochastic uncertain systems.

Thirdly, in terms of the model, previous investigations (Evron et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023; Goldfarb et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024) mainly focus on linear regression and assume the existence of a share the same global minimizer, i.e., all tasks are generated by a linear model with the same regression coefficient. In practice, there might only exist an approximate common global minimizer due to distribution shifts, and the model is often nonlinear (e.g., with sigmoid (Hastie, 2009) or ReLU (Glorot et al., 2011) activations). Besides, some literature (Evron et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2024; Banayeeanzade et al., 2024; Goldfarb et al., 2024) necessitates an over-parameterized regime that the data dimension is larger than the data size, which could be inapplicable for large-scale datasets.

Contributions. The above limitations indicate that the theoretical investigation of continual learning is still in its infancy, and further effort is necessary to establish a deep understanding of the underlying principles. In this paper, we aim to establish the convergence of CL with general nonlinear regressions without i.i.d data assumptions, showing that the above-mentioned limitations can be largely relaxed or removed. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose two novel continual learning algorithms to estimate the unknown parameters of the stochastic regression model. The former is applied to a class of nonlinear regression models with a shared global minimizer existing, while the latter can be applied to general linear regressions with only an approximate common global minimizer existing.
- In the presence of a shared global minimizer, for the first time, we establish almost sure global convergence for nonlinear regressions under a general data condition based on stochastic Lyapunov function and martingale estimation techniques. Based on the parameter estimates, we provide the convergence rate for both forgetting and regret metrics without any excitation condition on the data.
- When only an approximate common global minimizer exists, we establish the almost sure global convergence of the continual learning with general linear regressions under a general data condition, and provide the convergence rates for the forgetting and regret metrics.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the problem formulation, including the basic notation, model description and continual learning algorithm. Section 3 states the main results and the paper is concluded with some remarks in Section 4. The corresponding proofs of the main results are provided in the Appendix.

2. Problem Formulation

Basic Notations. For a d -dimensional column vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, v^\top and $\|v\|$ denote its transpose and Euclidean norm, respectively. Also, for a $d \times d$ -dimensional matrix A , $\|A\|$ denotes its Euclidean norm (i.e., $(\lambda_{\max}\{AA^\top\})^{\frac{1}{2}}$), $\text{Tr}(A)$ is the trace, and the maximum and minimum eigenvalues are denoted by $\lambda_{\max}\{A\}$ and $\lambda_{\min}\{A\}$, respectively. For two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $A > (\geq) B$ means that $A - B$ is a positive (semi-positive)-definite matrix. Throughout this paper, $|\cdot|$ denotes the determinant of the corresponding matrix. For a matrix sequence $\{A_k, k \geq 0\}$ and a positive scalar sequence $\{b_k, k \geq 0\}$, we say that $A_k = O(b_k)$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|A_k\| \leq Cb_k$ holds for all $k \geq 0$, and $A_k = o(b_k)$ if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|A_k\|/b_k = 0$.

We use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ to denote the mathematical expectation operator, and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_k]$ to denote the conditional mathematical expectation operator, where $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$ is a sequence of non-decreasing σ -algebras. A sequence of random variable $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}$ is said to be adapted to $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$ if \mathbf{x}_k is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable for all $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, if $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{k+1}|\mathcal{F}_k] = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, then the adapted sequence $\{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ is called a martingale difference sequence. For the linear space \mathbb{R}^d ($d \geq 1$), the weighted norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{Q}}$ associated with a positive definite matrix \mathbf{Q} is defined as $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

General Model Description. This paper focuses on the problem of learning a set of regression tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{0, \dots, t, \dots, m\}$ arriving sequentially in time. We assume data of the task at continual stage t is generated by a standard stochastic nonlinear regression model:

$$y_{t,i} = f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_t^*, z_{t,i}), \quad t \geq 0, i \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a known function, $\mathbf{w}_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the unknown true parameter to be estimated, $\mathbf{x}_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $y_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ are the feature vector, model output, and the system noises, respectively. The data for each task $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is denoted as $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(\mathbf{x}_t^i, y_t^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_t}$, where n_t is the sample size. At learning stage t , task \mathcal{T}_t can be solved by minimizing some objective of the form

$$\mathcal{S}_t := \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{L}_t(\mathbf{w}; \mathcal{D}_t), \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{S}_t is the set of global minimizers of some form of learning objective \mathcal{L}_t . After learning task t , we get a new estimation $\mathbf{w}_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$. The aim of CL is to solve the tasks sequentially and find some ground truth in the hypothesis space \mathcal{W} that minimizes the loss of all tasks. Specifically, we define the parameter variation process $\{\Delta_t\}$ as $\Delta_t = \mathbf{w}_t^* - \mathbf{w}^*$, and investigate two cases:

- **Case 1:** $\bigcap_{t=1}^m \mathcal{S}_t \neq \emptyset$, which assumes that all tasks are generated by the same model \mathbf{w}^* , sharing a common global minimizer, as illustrated in Figure 1 (a). If an algorithm can find the common global minimizer, we say it never forgets.
- **Case 2:** $\bigcap_{t=1}^m \mathcal{S}_t = \emptyset$ while $\frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{t=1}^m \Delta_t = 0$, which is a more general setting that relaxes the Case 1 into the existence of approximate common global minimizer (Figure 1 (b)), i.e., the optimal model parameters might be different for different tasks, and continual learning without forgetting is infeasible.




Figure 1: Illustration of continual learning scenarios investigated in this paper. (a) All tasks share the same global minimizer w^* . (b) A more general setting that relaxes case 1 into the existence of an approximate common global minimizer. Solid line with an arrow denotes the optimization trajectory of CL algorithm. Dashed line denotes naive sequent fine-tuning, which suffers from catastrophic forgetting.

Case 1 assumes that all tasks share a common global minimizer, i.e., $w^* \in \cap_{t=1}^m \mathcal{S}_t$. This is actually a common setting in existing CL studies (Evron et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2024; Banay-eanzade et al., 2024; Goldfarb et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023). However, those works only investigated this setting with linear regressions. In this paper, we extend it to general nonlinear setting including both nonlinear regression and classification. In addition, we further study a general case 2 where $\cap_{t=1}^m \mathcal{S}_t = \emptyset$ and only an approximate common global minimizer $w^* \in \mathcal{W}$ exists for linear models, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Performance Metric. The main goal in continual learning is to adapt to new tasks while not forgetting the knowledge of previous tasks. For example, an autonomous car should maintain the ability in previous environments after being trained in a new environment. Besides, we also expect that with knowledge accumulation during continual learning, the model is more robust on tasks with unseen domains, e.g., the autonomous car should be robust when encountering unseen environments before learning it. To characterize the above two aspects, we formally define the forgetting and regret as follows (Evron et al., 2022; Doan et al., 2021):

Definition 1 (*Forgetting & Regret*) Let $\mathcal{D}_k = \{(\mathbf{x}_k^i, y_k^i)\}_{i=1}^{n_k}$ be the data of task $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. The forgetting at continual stage t is the average loss of already seen tasks, and the regret is the average loss on unseen tasks, i.e.,

$$F_t := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathcal{D}_k), \quad R_t := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}; \mathcal{D}_k).$$

2.1. Case 1: Continual Learning with Common Global Minimizer

Before presenting the continual learning algorithm for the case with a common global minimizer, we introduce the following assumptions:

Assumption 1 For every task t , the number of samples n_t is finite and the feature $\{x_{t,i}\}$ satisfies:

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \sup_{i \geq 0} \|x_{t,i}\| < L, \quad a.s. \quad (3)$$

Remark 1 *The assumption that n_t is finite is meaningful for continual learning that learns a stream of tasks incrementally. For the case $n_t \rightarrow \infty$, our analysis is also applicable and similar results can be obtained. The assumption that the norm of the data is bounded generalizes that in (Evron et al., 2022). We remark that this is a mild condition that is commonly used in learning theory literature (Novikoff, 1962; Vapnik, 2013; Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014). In practice, raw data is almost always subjected to normalization or standardization before being fed into models (Nixon and Aguado, 2019; Camacho-Collados and Pilehvar, 2018). Besides, data generation processes in real-world scenarios inherently follow physical boundaries. Therefore, the above boundedness assumption can be easily achieved in practice.*

To estimate the true parameter \mathbf{w}^* , we design regularized continual learning algorithms with learning objective at the continual stage t is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_t(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}, y_{t,i}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_{t-1}\|_{\mathbf{Q}_{t-1}}^2. \quad (4)$$

Define $g_1(x, y) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(x, y)}{\partial x}$ and $g_2(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}(x, y)}{\partial^2 x}$. For our theoretical analysis, we need the following mild assumption on the objective function:

Assumption 2 *The objective function satisfies the following properties:*

i) *For every sample $\mathbf{x}_{t,i}$ in every task t , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g_1 \left(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = 0;$$

ii) *For any $C \geq 0$ and any $|\xi_{t,i}| \leq C$, we have*

$$\inf_{t \geq 0} \inf_{|\xi_{t,i}| \leq C} \mathbb{E} [g_2(\xi_{t,i}, y_{t,i}) | \mathcal{F}_t] \geq \underline{\mu} > 0, \text{ and } \sup_{|\xi_{t,i}| \leq C} g_2(\xi_{t,i}, y_{t,i}) \leq \bar{\mu} < \infty, \text{ a.s.}$$

Remark 2 *This assumption covers a wide range of commonly used regression and classification models, which are detailed below:*

1) **Standard linear regression model** widely used for the data fitting tasks (Zhao et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023; Evron et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023):

$$y_{t,i} = \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* + z_{t,i},$$

where the system noise $\{z_{t,i}, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ is a martingale difference sequence. Consider the following mean square loss function

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}, y_{t,i}) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w} - y_{t,i})^2.$$

In this case, $g_1(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) = \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - y_{t,i} = -z_{t,i}$ and $g_2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - y_{t,i}) = 1$, which clearly satisfy our assumption.

2) **Logistic regression model** widely used for the classification tasks (Tortajada et al., 2015; Evron et al., 2023; De Lange et al., 2021; Mai et al., 2022):

$$y_{t,i} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)} + z_{t,i},$$

Algorithm 1 Case 1: Continual Learning with Common Global Minimizer

Initialization: $w_0, \mathbf{Q}_0 = I$
Iterative update for each task $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \Pi_{\mathbf{Q}_t} \left[\mathbf{w}_{t-1} - \mathbf{Q}_t^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} g_1(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_{t-1}, y_{t,i}) \mathbf{x}_{t,i} \right) \right], \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_t = \mathbf{Q}_{t-1} + \mu^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \mathbf{x}_{t,i} \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top, \quad (5b)$$

where $\mu^2 \in (0, \underline{\mu})$ is the adaptation gain scalar sequence, and the projection operator $\Pi_{\mathbf{Q}_{t+1}}(x)$ is defined in (6).

where $z_{t,i}$ is the same as in the previous example. Consider the following cross-entropy loss function

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}, y_{t,i}) = -y_{t,i} \log(f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w})) - (1 - y_{t,i}) \log(1 - f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w})).$$

where $f(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$. Then it follows that

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) = f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*) - y_{t,i} = -z_{t,i} \text{ and } g_2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) = f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)(1 - f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)),$$

which also satisfy our assumption.

3) **Stochastic saturation model** widely used for censored or truncated regression tasks (Breen, 1996; Daskalakis et al., 2019):

$$s_{t,i} = \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* + z_{t,i},$$

$$y_{t,i} = \begin{cases} U, & \text{if } s_{t,i} \geq u, \\ s_{t,i}, & \text{if } l \leq s_{t,i} \leq u, \\ L, & \text{if } s_{t,i} \leq l, \end{cases}$$

where the system noise $\{z_{t,i}, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ is dependent with a zero mean and variance 1 Gaussian distribution. This includes the widely used models with ReLU activation (Nair and Hinton, 2010; Glorot et al., 2011). Consider the following negative log-likelihood loss function:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}, y_{t,i}) &= -\log \mathcal{Q}_n(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}, y_{t,i}) \\ &= -\delta_{t,i} \log(F(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w})) - (1 - \delta_{t,i} - \bar{\delta}_{t,i}) \log(f(y_{t,i} - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w})) - \bar{\delta}_{t,i} \log(1 - F(u - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w})), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{t,i} = I_{\{y_{t,i}=L\}}$, $\bar{\delta}_{t,i} = I_{\{y_{t,i}=U\}}$, $F(x)$ and $f(x)$ are the cumulative distribution function and probability dense function of normal distribution, respectively. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) &= \delta_{t,i} \frac{f(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)}{F(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)} + (1 - \delta_{t,i} - \bar{\delta}_{t,i}) \frac{f(y_{t,i} - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)}{f(y_{t,i} - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)} - \bar{\delta}_{t,i} \frac{f(u - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)}{1 - F(u - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)}, \\ g_2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) &= \frac{(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*) f(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*) F(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*) + f^2(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)}{F^2(l - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*)} \delta_{t,i} \\ &\quad + \frac{(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - u) f(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - u) F(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - u) + f^2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - u)}{F^2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^* - u)} \bar{\delta}_{t,i} + (1 - \delta_{t,i} - \bar{\delta}_{t,i}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathbb{E} \left[g_1 \left(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = 0$. Besides, by the facts that $\frac{xf(x)F(x)+f^2(x)}{F^2(x)} \in (0, 1)$ for $x \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ and it is a strictly decreasing function (see Lemma 1 in (Zhao et al., 2016)), there exists a positive $\underline{\mu}$ such that $g_2(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{t,i}) \geq \underline{\mu}$ for $|\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*|$ in any bounded set. So our assumption is still satisfied.

We propose a continual learning algorithm (i.e., Algorithm 1) to estimate the parameter \mathbf{w} recursively. In Algorithm 1, we introduce a projection operator to ensure the boundedness of the parameter estimates:

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{Q}_t}(x) = \arg \min_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \|x - w\|_{\mathbf{Q}_t}, \quad (6)$$

here $\mathcal{H} = \{w : \|w\| \leq M\}$ with $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, we design an adaptation gain scalar μ in order to ensure the convergence of parameter estimates by leveraging the lower bound of the second-order derivative for the loss function. Specifically, for the learning tasks of linear regression models, the scalar factor μ can be set to 1, which is consistent with the classical least squares algorithm.

2.2. Case 2: Continual Learning without Common Global Minimizer

When no global minimizer is shared among tasks, a few recent works studied this setting (Lin et al., 2023; Banayeezade et al., 2024; Goldfarb et al., 2024). However, they require a stringent assumption that the linear regression model being over-parameterized, which may be invalid when involving large datasets. Moreover, the bounds of forgetting in those work are yields in an expectation form with i.i.d data assumption and Gaussian noise condition. Differently, we investigate general linear regressions where an approximate common global minimizer exist, and establish the almost sure global convergence results for the first time. Particularly, recent state-of-the-art CL methods (Zhuang et al., 2022; McDonnell et al., 2024) typically build upon pre-trained backbone with a linear model, and consider that linear regression result can also be applied to complex models like deep networks in the neural kernel regime (Doan et al., 2021; Evron et al., 2022), thus we leave the extension of our results in case 2 to the more complex nonlinear setting as future work.

To be specific, we consider the model (1) with a linear function f , i.e., $y_{t,i} = \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_t^* + z_{t,i}$, $t \geq 0$, $i \geq 0$. In order to establish a rigorous result, we need some specific assumptions on the true parameters $\{\mathbf{w}_t^*\}$, the system noise $\{z_{t,i}\}$ and the feature data $\{x_{t,i}\}$. Before presenting these assumptions, we first define two σ -sequences \mathcal{F}_t and \mathcal{G}_t as: $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{\mathbf{x}_{s,i}, z_{s-1,i}, \mathbf{w}_s^*, 1 \leq i \leq n_s, 0 \leq s \leq t\}$, and $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma\{\mathbf{x}_{s,i}, z_{s-1,i}, \mathbf{w}_{s-1}^*, 1 \leq i \leq n_s, 0 \leq s \leq t\}$.

Assumption 3 *The parameter variation $\{\mathbf{w}_t^* - \mathbf{w}^*, \mathcal{G}_t\}$ is a martingale difference sequence and there exists $\beta > 2$ such that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{w}_t^* - \mathbf{w}^*\|^\beta | \mathcal{G}_t] < \infty$, a.s.*

Remark 3 *We provide some examples that satisfy our assumption:*

1) For each task t , the true parameter is $\mathbf{w}_t^* = \mathbf{w}^* + \Delta_t$, where Δ_t is a Gaussian random vector (i.e., $\Delta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$) or be uniformly sampled from $[-c, c]^d$, and Δ_t is independent of all previous tasks.

2) For each task t , assume that the true parameter \mathbf{w}_t^* is i.i.d. sampled from a parameter set $\{\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_s\}$ with a distribution $P(\mathbf{w}_t^* = \mathbf{w}_i) = \pi_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s \pi_i = 1$, as in the mixed linear regression learning problem (Liu et al., 2024). Then the parameter variation process $\Delta_t = \mathbf{w}_t^* - \mathbf{w}^*$ satisfies Assumption 3 with $\mathbf{w}^* = \sum_{i=1}^s \pi_i \mathbf{w}_i$.

Algorithm 2 Case 2: Continual Learning without Common Global Minimizer

Initialization: $w_0, \mathbf{Q}_0 = I$
Iterative update for each task $t \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \mathbf{w}_{t-1} + \mathbf{Q}_t^{-1} \beta_t \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \mathbf{x}_{t,i} (y_{t,i} - \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_{t-1}), \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_t = \mathbf{Q}_{t-1} + \beta_t \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \mathbf{x}_{t,i} \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top, \quad (8b)$$

 where $\{\beta_t\}$ is an adaptation gain sequence.

Assumption 4 The noise sequence $\{\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} z_{t,i}, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ is a martingale difference sequence and there exists a $\alpha > 2$ such that $\sup_{t \geq 0} E[\|\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} z_{t,i}\|^\alpha | \mathcal{F}_t] < \infty$, a.s.

Assumption 5 For every task t , the number of samples n_t is finite. Besides, there exists a constant $\delta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \|\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\|^2 = O(t^\delta)$, a.s.

Remark 4 We remark that $\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \|\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\|^2 = O(t^\delta)$ is a mild condition that can be easily satisfied. Here we provide several widely used examples (Chen and Guo, 2012):

- 1) If $\{\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\}$ is bounded as that in Assumption 1 of Case 1, then the parameter δ can be zero.
- 2) If $\{\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\}$ is i.i.d. Gaussian as used in previous investigations (Zhao et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023), then $\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} \|\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\|^2 = O(\log t)$ and the parameter δ can be chosen as any small positive constant;
- 3) If there exists a constant $\alpha > 4$ such that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\|^\alpha] < \infty$, then the parameter δ can be any constant in $(\frac{2}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{2})$.

The learning objective for CL of the general linear regression model at the stage t is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_t(\mathbf{w}) = \beta_t \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} (\mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top \mathbf{w} - y_{t,i})^2 + \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}_{t-1}\|_{\mathbf{Q}_{t-1}}^2. \quad (7)$$

We propose a continual learning algorithm (i.e., Algorithm 2) to estimate the parameter recursively. Unlike directly using Algorithm 1 for linear regression model with mean square loss, in Algorithm 2, we introduce an additional adaptation gain sequence $\{\beta_t\}$ to address the difficulty that caused by the possible unboundedness of the feature data $\{\mathbf{x}_{t,i}\}$. Besides, by adjusting the value of $\{\beta_t\}$, we can allocate different importance weights for different tasks. For instance, in healthcare applications, our algorithm allows the model to allocate importance weights when learning from different task streams based on task significance and operational constraints (Feng et al., 2022).

3. Main Results

This section presents the main results for Case 1 & 2, including the convergence results, the convergence rates of forgetting and regret metrics. Our analysis leverages stochastic Lyapunov functions and martingale estimation techniques, which help us to relax some commonly used yet stringent

conditions such as the i.i.d data assumption, the persistent excitation and noise conditions of classical analysis in continual learning, making it highly applicable for future theoretical investigation. The detailed proof of those results can be found in the Appendix.

3.1. Global Convergence Results for Case 1

For case 1 where a shared global minimizer exists, we prove the convergence of the continual learning algorithm in a nonlinear setting which includes widely used models such as standard linear regression, logistic regression based classification, and the stochastic saturation model. Then based on the proposed algorithm, we provide the upper bounds of accumulated forgetting and regrets.

Theorem 1 *Under Assumptions 1-2, the estimation error generated by Algorithm 1 has the following upper bound as $m \rightarrow \infty$:*

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m\|^2 = O\left(\frac{\log m}{\lambda_{\min}(m)}\right), \text{ a.s.}, \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m = \mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{w}^*$ and $\lambda_{\min}(m) = \lambda_{\min}\left\{\mathbf{Q}_0 + \sum_{t=1}^m \sum_{i=0}^{n_t} \mathbf{x}_{t,i} \mathbf{x}_{t,i}^\top\right\}$.

Remark 5 *Theorem 1 shows that if*

$$\log m = o(\lambda_{\min}(m)), \text{ a.s.} \quad (10)$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, then the estimate \mathbf{w}_m will converge to the true unknown parameter \mathbf{w}^* almost surely. We remark that (10) is a general data condition that does not impose strict informational richness on individual tasks, such as the i.i.d. Gaussian or the traditional persistent excitation i.e., $m = O(\lambda_{\min}(m))$, a.s. In fact, condition (10) is exactly the **weakest possible** excitation condition established for the convergence of classical least squares of linear regression models (Lai and Wei, 1982). Moreover, we also note that the convergence rate established in Theorem 1 is essentially in terms of the increase of the number of observations rather than the number of iterations in computation, which makes it also applicable for online continual learning setting (Mai et al., 2022).

To establish the performance analysis of our continual learning algorithm, we first introduce the following index that quantifies the optimal loss value over all past t tasks at a shared global minimizer \mathbf{w}^* :

$$\mathcal{L}_t^* = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*, y_{k,i}\right), \quad (11)$$

which is usually achievable by joint training (a standard approach where all tasks are trained simultaneously).

Theorem 2 *Under Assumptions 1-2, the forgetting metric defined in Definition 1 has the following upper bound:*

$$F_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_t; \mathcal{D}_k) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_t, y_{k,i}\right) = \mathcal{L}_t^* + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log t}{t}}\right), \text{ a.s.} \quad (12)$$

Moreover, the regret metric defined in Definition 1 has the following upper bound:

$$R_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}; \mathcal{D}_k) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, y_{k,i}) = \mathcal{L}_t^* + O\left(\frac{\log t}{t}\right), \text{ a.s.} \quad (13)$$

Remark 6 Actually, the term \mathcal{L}_t^* can be viewed as a measure of system noise. As shown in the examples in Remark 2, the optimal loss value is usually determined by the variance of system noise. In noiseless settings, such as those in (Evron et al., 2022, 2023; Peng et al., 2023), the optimal loss value is zero naturally. We note that the convergence result in an almost sure sense established in Theorem 2 is better than the convergence in mean in existing studies (Lin et al., 2023). Moreover, we establish the convergence rate for the forgetting and regret metrics for the first time and the convergence rate of regret is potentially the **best possible** in the noise setting among all continual learners. In addition, these convergence results do not require any excitation or richness condition on the feature data, and instead, they only require the boundedness of the feature data, which is considerably weaker than the persistent excitation condition used in the existing literature.

3.2. Global Convergence Results for Case 2

For case 2 where only an approximate common global minimizer exists, we establish the convergence of the continual learning with general linear regressions and provide the convergence rates of forgetting and accumulated regrets, respectively.

Theorem 3 Under Assumptions 3-5, the estimation error produced by Algorithm 2 with $\beta_t = \frac{1}{t^\delta}$ has the following upper bound:

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m\|^2 = O\left(\frac{m^\delta \log m}{\lambda_{\min}(m)}\right), \text{ a.s.}, \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m = \mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{w}^*$, $\lambda_{\min}(m)$ is defined in Theorem 1, and δ is defined in Assumption 5.

Remark 7 Theorem 1 shows that if as $\sum_{t=1}^m n_t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$m^\delta \log m = o(\lambda_{\min}(m)), \text{ a.s.}, \quad (15)$$

then the estimate \mathbf{w}_m will converge to the parameter \mathbf{w}^* almost surely. Moreover, when the feature data is bounded, the convergence rate can be the same as that in Theorem 1.

To further establish the performance analysis, we introduce the following two indexes:

$$\mathcal{L}_t^* = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left(y_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}^*\right)^2, \quad \mathcal{P}_t^* = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left(y_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_t^*\right)^2 \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{L}_t^* is the optimal loss value at a shared global minimizer \mathbf{w}^* over all past t tasks, and \mathcal{P}_t^* is the optimal value of all past task t with its true parameter \mathbf{w}_t^* .




Figure 2: Numerical demonstration of Case 2: (a) SGD suffers from catastrophic forgetting when continually learning 100 tasks. (b) Our algorithm can successfully find the approximate common global minimizer in sequential and (c) random learning orders.

Theorem 4 *Under Assumptions 3-5, the forgetting metric has the following upper bound:*

$$F_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left(y_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_t \right)^2 = \mathcal{L}_t^* + O\left(\frac{t^\delta (\log t)^{1/2}}{t^{1/2}} \right), \text{ a.s.} \quad (17)$$

Moreover, the regret metric has the following upper bound:

$$R_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left(y_{k,i} - \mathbf{x}_{k,i}^\top \mathbf{w}_{k-1} \right)^2 = \mathcal{L}_t^* + O\left(\frac{t^\delta \log t}{t} \right), \text{ a.s.} \quad (18)$$

Remark 8 *We note that similar to Theorem 2, the almost sure convergence results for forgetting and regret metrics do not impose any excitation condition on the feature data, which is better than the convergence in mean under i.i.d. Gaussian data assumptions established in existing studies (Lin et al., 2023). Moreover, unlike case 1 where the optimal value \mathcal{L}_t^* is entirely determined by the system noise (leading to $\mathcal{P}_t^* = \mathcal{L}_t^*$), in case 2, one can easily find that $\mathcal{P}_t^* \leq \mathcal{L}_t^*$, which reflects the additional influence of the parameter variation variance on \mathcal{L}_t^* .*

Numerical Demonstration. Experiments are conducted to illustrate the effectiveness of our algorithm. We assume the $d = 2$ and introduce *meta parameters* $([4, 2], [5.5, -1.5], [3, -1])$ to generate three groups of true parameters for 100 tasks by applying noise perturbation (i.e., $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.5)$) to meta parameters. Then, for each task, 200 samples are generated using a linear regression model based on the sampled true parameter with noise perturbation (i.e., $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.2)$), and then the 100 tasks are learned continually. In this case, there is no common global minimizer shared among all tasks, and the approximate common global minimizer is $[4, -\frac{1}{6}]$. We define two learning orders named sequential and random: at each stage, the former learns the tasks in the three meta groups sequentially while the latter learns a task random samples from 100 tasks.

We compare our algorithm with SGD in estimating the unknown approximate common global minimizer. Without regularization, the SGD Algorithm suffers from catastrophic forgetting (Figure 2 (a)), e.g., if the parameter of task $t + 1$ is from another group, the estimator will directly overfit it, forgetting the current task t . Differently, our algorithm successfully finds the approximate common global minimizer in both sequential (Figure 2 (b)) and random (Figure 2 (c)) learning orders.

4. Concluding Remarks

This paper establishes the theoretical foundation for continual learning, which is one of the central problems in current machine learning community. On the one hand, in the presence of a shared global minimizer, we demonstrate the global convergence of CL for a class of nonlinear regression models. This includes widely used models such as standard linear regression, logistic regression based classification, and the stochastic saturation model. On the other hand, we prove the global convergence of CL for general linear regressions when no shared global minimizer exists. To our best knowledge, our work provides the first convergence results for continual learning under a non-i.i.d. and non-persistent excitation data assumptions. Furthermore, without any excitation condition on the feature data, we establish the convergence rate for the forgetting and regret metrics for the first time, and the convergence rate of regret is potentially the best possible in the noise setting among all continual learners. Several intriguing theoretical directions remain for further exploration, e.g., the convergence of nonlinear CL when no common global minimizer existing. We hope our work could provide a deep understanding of CL and facilitate the development of new, practical approaches.

References

- Rahaf Aljundi, Francesca Babiloni, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Marcus Rohrbach, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 139–154, 2018.
- Haruka Asanuma, Shiro Takagi, Yoshihiro Nagano, Yuki Yoshida, Yasuhiko Igarashi, and Masato Okada. Statistical mechanical analysis of catastrophic forgetting in continual learning with teacher and student networks. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 90(10):104001, 2021.
- Mohammadamin Banayeeanzade, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, and Mohammad Rostami. Theoretical insights into overparameterized models in multi-task and replay-based continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16939*, 2024.
- Mehdi Abbana Bennani and Masashi Sugiyama. Generalisation guarantees for continual learning with orthogonal gradient descent. In *4th Lifelong Machine Learning Workshop at ICML, 2020*.
- Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- Richard Breen. *Regression Models: Censored, Sample Selected, or Truncated Data*. Sage, 1996.
- Jose Camacho-Collados and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar. From word to sense embeddings: A survey on vector representations of meaning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 63:743–788, 2018.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Marcus Rohrbach, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Efficient lifelong learning with a-gem. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Hanfu Chen and Lei Guo. *Identification and Stochastic Adaptive Control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- Corinna Cortes, Xavier Gonzalvo, Vitaly Kuznetsov, Mehryar Mohri, and Scott Yang. Adanet: Adaptive structural learning of artificial neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 874–883, 2017.
- Constantinos Daskalakis, Themis Gouleakis, Christos Tzamos, and Manolis Zampetakis. Computationally and statistically efficient truncated regression. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 955–960, 2019.
- Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Aleš Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(7):3366–3385, 2021.
- Meng Ding, Kaiyi Ji, Di Wang, and Jinhui Xu. Understanding forgetting in continual learning with linear regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Thang Doan, Mehdi Abbana Bennani, Bogdan Mazoure, Guillaume Rabusseau, and Pierre Alquier. A theoretical analysis of catastrophic forgetting through the ntk overlap matrix. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1072–1080, 2021.
- Shibhansh Dohare, J Fernando Hernandez-Garcia, Qingfeng Lan, Parash Rahman, A Rupam Mahmood, and Richard S Sutton. Loss of plasticity in deep continual learning. *Nature*, 632(8026): 768–774, 2024.
- Itay Evron, Edward Moroshko, Rachel Ward, Nathan Srebro, and Daniel Soudry. How catastrophic can catastrophic forgetting be in linear regression? In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4028–4079, 2022.
- Itay Evron, Edward Moroshko, Gon Buzaglo, Maroun Khriesh, Badea Marjeh, Nathan Srebro, and Daniel Soudry. Continual learning in linear classification on separable data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9440–9484, 2023.
- Mehrdad Farajtabar, Navid Azizan, Alex Mott, and Ang Li. Orthogonal gradient descent for continual learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3762–3773, 2020.
- Jean Feng, Rachael V Phillips, Ivana Malenica, Andrew Bishara, Alan E Hubbard, Leo A Celi, and Romain Pirracchio. Clinical artificial intelligence quality improvement: towards continual monitoring and updating of ai algorithms in healthcare. *NPJ digital medicine*, 5(1):66, 2022.
- Xavier Glorot, Antoine Bordes, and Yoshua Bengio. Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 315–323. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- Daniel Goldfarb, Itay Evron, Nir Weinberger, Daniel Soudry, and PAul HAnd. The joint effect of task similarity and overparameterization on catastrophic forgetting—an analytical model. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Ian J Goodfellow, Mehdi Mirza, Da Xiao, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6211*, 2013.

- Haiyang Guo, Fei Zhu, Wenzhuo Liu, Xu-Yao Zhang, and Cheng-Lin Liu. Pilora: Prototype guided incremental lora for federated class-incremental learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 141–159. Springer, 2024.
- Trevor Hastie. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, 2009.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Xisen Jin, Arka Sadhu, Junyi Du, and Xiang Ren. Gradient-based editing of memory examples for online task-free continual learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 29193–29205, 2021.
- Zixuan Ke, Yijia Shao, Haowei Lin, Tatsuya Konishi, Gyuhak Kim, and Bing Liu. Continual pre-training of language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Mayank Kejriwal, Eric Kildebeck, Robert Steininger, and Abhinav Shrivastava. Challenges, evaluation and opportunities for open-world learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(6):580–588, 2024.
- Gyuhak Kim, Changnan Xiao, Tatsuya Konishi, Zixuan Ke, and Bing Liu. A theoretical study on solving continual learning. volume 35, pages 5065–5079, 2022.
- Gyuhak Kim, Changnan Xiao, Tatsuya Konishi, and Bing Liu. Learnability and algorithm for continual learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 16877–16896, 2023.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017.
- Tze Leung Lai and Ching Zong Wei. Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 10(1): 154–166, 1982.
- Cecilia S Lee and Aaron Y Lee. Clinical applications of continual learning machine learning. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 2(6):e279–e281, 2020.
- Sebastian Lee, Sebastian Goldt, and Andrew Saxe. Continual learning in the teacher-student setup: Impact of task similarity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6109–6119, 2021.
- Timothée Lesort, Vincenzo Lomonaco, Andrei Stoian, Davide Maltoni, David Filliat, and Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez. Continual learning for robotics: Definition, framework, learning strategies, opportunities and challenges. *Information fusion*, 58:52–68, 2020.
- Haoran Li, Jingfeng Wu, and Vladimir Braverman. Fixed design analysis of regularization-based continual learning. In *Conference on Lifelong Learning Agents*, pages 513–533, 2023.

- Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017.
- Sen Lin, Peizhong Ju, Yingbin Liang, and Ness Shroff. Theory on forgetting and generalization of continual learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 21078–21100, 2023.
- Zhiqiu Lin, Jia Shi, Deepak Pathak, and Deva Ramanan. The clear benchmark: Continual learning on real-world imagery. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2021.
- Xialei Liu, Yu-Song Hu, Xu-Sheng Cao, Andrew D Bagdanov, Ke Li, and Ming-Ming Cheng. Long-tailed class incremental learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 495–512. Springer, 2022.
- Yujing Liu, Zhixin Liu, and Lei Guo. Convergence of online learning algorithm for a mixture of multiple linear regressions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Zheda Mai, Ruiwen Li, Jihwan Jeong, David Quispe, Hyunwoo Kim, and Scott Sanner. Online continual learning in image classification: An empirical survey. *Neurocomputing*, 469:28–51, 2022.
- Pratik Mazumder, Pravendra Singh, and Piyush Rai. Few-shot lifelong learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 2337–2345, 2021.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier, 1989.
- Mark D McDonnell, Dong Gong, Amin Parvaneh, Ehsan Abbasnejad, and Anton van den Hengel. Ranpac: Random projections and pre-trained models for continual learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 36, 2024.
- Fei Mi, Xiaoyu Lin, and Boi Faltings. Ader: Adaptively distilled exemplar replay towards continual learning for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 408–413, 2020.
- Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E Hinton. Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 807–814, 2010.
- Kumpati S Narendra and Anuradha M Annaswamy. Persistent excitation in adaptive systems. *International Journal of Control*, 45(1):127–160, 1987.
- Mark Nixon and Alberto Aguado. *Feature Extraction and Image Processing for Computer Vision*. Academic Press, 2019.
- Albert BJ Novikoff. On convergence proofs on perceptrons. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on the Mathematical Theory of Automata*, volume 12, pages 615–622. New York, NY, 1962.
- Liangzu Peng, Paris Giampouras, and René Vidal. The ideal continual learner: An agent that never forgets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 27585–27610, 2023.

- Matthias Perkonig, Johannes Hofmanninger, Christian J Herold, James A Brink, Oleg Pinykh, Helmut Prosch, and Georg Langs. Dynamic memory to alleviate catastrophic forgetting in continual learning with medical imaging. *Nature communications*, 12(1):5678, 2021.
- Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Alexander Kolesnikov, Georg Sperl, and Christoph H Lampert. icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2001–2010, 2017.
- Matthew Riemer, Ignacio Cases, Robert Ajemian, Miao Liu, Irina Rish, Yuhai Tu, and Gerald Tesauro. Learning to learn without forgetting by maximizing transfer and minimizing interference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Andrei A Rusu, Neil C Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, et al. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016.
- Jonathan Schwarz, Wojciech Czarnecki, Jelena Luketina, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Yee Whye Teh, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Progress & compress: A scalable framework for continual learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4528–4537, 2018.
- Joan Serra, Didac Suris, Marius Miron, and Alexandros Karatzoglou. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting with hard attention to the task. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4548–4557, 2018.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- William Swartworth, Deanna Needell, Rachel Ward, Mark Kong, and Halyun Jeong. Nearly optimal bounds for cyclic forgetting. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 36, pages 68197–68206, 2023.
- Sebastian Thrun and Tom M Mitchell. Lifelong robot learning. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 15(1-2):25–46, 1995.
- Songsong Tian, Lusi Li, Weijun Li, Hang Ran, Xin Ning, and Prayag Tiwari. A survey on few-shot class-incremental learning. *Neural Networks*, 169:307–324, 2024.
- Salvador Tortajada, Montserrat Robles, and Juan Miguel García-Gómez. Incremental logistic regression for customizing automatic diagnostic models. *Data Mining in Clinical Medicine*, pages 57–78, 2015.
- Gido M Van de Ven, Tinne Tuytelaars, and Andreas S Tolias. Three types of incremental learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(12):1185–1197, 2022.
- Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 2013.
- Eli Verwimp, Kuo Yang, Sarah Parisot, Lanqing Hong, Steven McDonagh, Eduardo Pérez-Pellitero, Matthias De Lange, and Tinne Tuytelaars. Clad: A realistic continual learning benchmark for autonomous driving. *Neural Networks*, 161:659–669, 2023.

- Zifeng Wang, Zizhao Zhang, Chen-Yu Lee, Han Zhang, Ruoxi Sun, Xiaoqi Ren, Guolong Su, Vincent Perot, Jennifer Dy, and Tomas Pfister. Learning to prompt for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 139–149, 2022.
- Minhui Xie, Kai Ren, Youyou Lu, Guangxu Yang, Qingxing Xu, Bihai Wu, Jiazhen Lin, Hongbo Ao, Wanhong Xu, and Jiwu Shu. Kraken: memory-efficient continual learning for large-scale real-time recommendations. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–17. IEEE, 2020.
- Ju Xu and Zhanxing Zhu. Reinforced continual learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 31, 2018.
- Yutao Yang, Jie Zhou, Xuanwen Ding, Tianyu Huai, Shunyu Liu, Qin Chen, Yuan Xie, and Liang He. Recent advances of foundation language models-based continual learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2024.
- Huaxiu Yao, Caroline Choi, Bochuan Cao, Yoonho Lee, Pang Wei W Koh, and Chelsea Finn. Wild-time: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shift over time. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 35, pages 10309–10324, 2022.
- Jaehong Yoon, Wonyong Jeong, Giwoong Lee, Eunho Yang, and Sung Ju Hwang. Federated continual learning with weighted inter-client transfer. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12073–12086, 2021.
- Fanhu Zeng, Fei Zhu, Haiyang Guo, Xu-Yao Zhang, and Cheng-Lin Liu. Modalprompt: Dual-modality guided prompt for continual learning of large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05849*, 2024.
- Guanxiong Zeng, Yang Chen, Bo Cui, and Shan Yu. Continual learning of context-dependent processing in neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(8):364–372, 2019.
- Friedemann Zenke, Ben Poole, and Surya Ganguli. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3987–3995, 2017.
- Xuyang Zhao, Huiyuan Wang, Weiran Huang, and Wei Lin. A statistical theory of regularization-based continual learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Yanlong Zhao, Wenjian Bi, and Ting Wang. Iterative parameter estimate with batched binary-valued observations. *Science China. Information Sciences*, 59(5):052201, 2016.
- Fei Zhu, Xu-Yao Zhang, Chuang Wang, Fei Yin, and Cheng-Lin Liu. Prototype augmentation and self-supervision for incremental learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5871–5880, 2021.
- Huiping Zhuang, Zhenyu Weng, Hongxin Wei, Renchunzi Xie, Kar-Ann Toh, and Zhiping Lin. Acil: Analytic class-incremental learning with absolute memorization and privacy protection. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 35, pages 11602–11614, 2022.